

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the claims of the present application are respectfully requested.

Applicants acknowledge, with thanks, the Examiner's remarks that Claims 8 and 24 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claim. In order to expedite prosecution of the present application, applicants have amended Claims 1, 14 and 15 to include the allowable subject matter recited in Claim 8 or Claim 24. Thus, Claims 1, 14 and 15 have been amended to positively recite that the claimed DC node diffusion region is located within bulk silicon without oxide underneath thereby the DC node diffusion region is in contact with an underlying Si-containing substrate of said SOI substrate. Since Claims 1 and 15 include the subject matter of Claims 8 and 24 respectively, applicants have cancelled those two claims without prejudice.

In addition to the foregoing amendment to Claims 1, 14 and 15 and the cancellation of Claims 8 and 24, applicants have amended Claim 6 by changing the dependency of the claim from Claim 4 to Claim 5 as suggested by the Examiner in the instant Office Action.

Applicants respectfully submit that the above amendments to the claims do not introduce new matter into the specification of the instant application. Thus, applicants respectfully request entry of the same. Applicants further submit that the above amendments to the claims places the pending claims in condition for allowance over the art applied in the present Office Action.

In the present Office Action, Claims 1-5, 7, 9, 11, 12 14-17 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,489,792 to Hu, et

al. ("Hu, et al.").¹ Claims 6 and 22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as allegedly unpatentable over the combined disclosures of Hu, et al. and AAPA shown in FIGS. 1A-1B. Claims 12 and 18-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as allegedly unpatentable in view of Hu, et al.

Applicants respectfully submit that the various anticipation and obviousness rejections are moot in view of the amendment made to the claims hereinabove. That is, since each of the independent claims, i.e., Claims 1, 14 and 15 include the allowable feature that the claims DC node diffusion region *is located within bulk silicon without oxide underneath*, the claims of the present application are allowable over Hu, et al. alone, or Hu, et al. in combination with AAPA.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, the various anticipation and obviousness rejections have been obviated. Thus, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) and § 103 are respectfully requested.

Thus, in view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is firmly believed that the present case is in condition for allowance, which action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Leslie S. Szivos, Ph.D
Registration No. 39,394

SCULLY, SCOTT, MURPHY & PRESSER
400 Garden City Plaza, Suite 300
Garden City, New York 11530
(516) 742-4343
Customer No. 23389
LSS:jw

¹ Applicants observe that in the Office Action Claim 24 was listed as a rejected claim. This is in error given that the Examiner indicated Claim 24 as being allowable. Hence, the applicants have removed Claim 24 when stating the anticipation rejection in this response.